



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Hi-Desert Water District	County	San Bernardino
Project Title	Warren Valley Subbasin Groundwater Monitoring Program	Grant Request	\$ 208,950.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 225,950.00

Project Description: The proposed project installs a monitoring well into the east hydrogeological unit where a proposed wastewater treatment plan and collection system is to be placed for the protection of groundwater supply.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	2
Work Plan	4
Budget	2
Schedule	2
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	2
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	20

- **GWMP or Program:** A functional equivalent GWMP is in place via an adjudication of the groundwater rights of the Warren Valley Groundwater Basin, approved by the San Bernardino County Superior Court. The Hi-Desert Water District (HDWD) and other groundwater users in the basin entered into the agreement. The Hi-Valley Desert Water District (Grantee) Board of Directors serves as Basin Watermaster. A Warren Valley Basin GWMP was adopted by the Basin Watermaster in 1991, and was revised in 1996.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The District is requesting funds to install a monitoring well 1,000 feet into the saturated zone of the East Sub-unit. The well will provide depth-specific monitoring points to evaluate groundwater movement, changing water levels, and groundwater chemistry in the basin. The description demonstrated the need and technical feasibility for the project. However, the multiple-well monitoring site information lacked detail with respect to the number of wells, timing of the “eventual” monitoring of vertical movement of wastewater in the saturated zone, and a description of the specific location for the “multiple well monitoring site in the vicinity of the WWTP.” The map supplied in the application does not contain this information. The applicant did not describe how the applicant collaborates with other local agencies and how they will keep stakeholders and the public informed of the project, nor any discussion of how information will be disseminated. The applicant mentions that this well will be part of the District’s ongoing Cooperative Water Resources Monitoring Program with the USGS. It is implied but not stated that this means the USGS will continue to fund all monitoring after grant funds are expended and that the District will not contribute any funding.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The work plan presented lacks details and subtasks, such that the proposal would not be ready to be placed into an agreement. There was no discussion about access to private property, and how it would be gained, if needed. No discussion was presented of a sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance. Project deliverables do not include any reports (quarterly or final). CEQA and other permitting compliance efforts were not described. No description of the GWMP itself was provided and how the project relates to it. No information was given as to how interested parties would be able to obtain data. No information was provided as to when or how the project will transfer over to the USGS Cooperative Water Resources Monitoring Program mentioned in the Project Description.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The budget did not provide enough information to adequately determine whether funds would be sufficient or distributed properly among tasks. There was no cost breakdown for personnel needed, hours or hourly rates or documentation to show how the direct project administration cost was derived. A quote from USGS indicates that the project will cost \$216,000 for drilling, geophysical logs, installation of 3 piezometers, cost of electronics, and labor. However, there is no detailed breakdown of costs to back up what is presented in the budget table. There was no rationale for how the costs for those tasks were extracted from the USGS quote.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The schedule did not provide any timelines, and the tasks did not correspond to those in the Budget or Work Plan. Sampling was only given 1 week duration, although the Work Plan objectives describe long-term WQ monitoring. The schedule is too simplistic and does not contain detailed tasks and subtasks. For example, under well drilling, there may have been items such as time to mobilize and demobilize. There was no discussion of anticipated obstacles.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The elements of a QA/QC plan were described but no plan was not described, although QA/QC measures were listed with links provided. The links referenced USGS field manuals for collection of water quality data, publishing policies, and documentation of GIS metadata. It appears that USGS would be involved but it is not clear in the description how HDWD and USGS personnel would collaborate in the effort. The project manager will be Tracy Nishikawa of USGS. Her credentials were not included in this section.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The applicant received a grant through the EPA in May 2011. The applicant provides a successful EPA grant proposal work plan, but there is no information about the outcome of the work performed, although the applicant mentions deliverables and that the project was completed December 2011. The attached documentation shows the tasks that were performed for the project, but does not demonstrate that the project was completed on schedule and on budget.